

Primitive divisors of Lucas and Lehmer sequences, III

By PAUL M VOUTIER

Department of Mathematics, City University, London, EC1V 0HB, UK

Abstract

In this paper we prove that if $n > 30\,030$ then the n -th element of any Lucas or Lehmer sequence has a primitive divisor.

1. *Introduction*

This is the third in a series of articles by the author attacking a conjecture that for $n > 30$, the n -th element of any Lucas or Lehmer sequence always has a primitive divisor.

We start by recalling the definitions of these terms.

Let α and β be algebraic numbers such that $\alpha + \beta$ and $\alpha\beta$ are relatively prime non-zero rational integers and α/β is not a root of unity. The sequence $(u_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ defined by $u_n = \frac{\alpha^n - \beta^n}{\alpha - \beta}$ for $n \geq 0$ is called a *Lucas sequence*.

If, instead of supposing that $\alpha + \beta \in \mathbb{Z}$, we only suppose that $(\alpha + \beta)^2$ is a non-zero rational integer, still relatively prime to $\alpha\beta$, then we define the *Lehmer sequence* $(u_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ associated to α and β by

$$u_n = \frac{\alpha^n - \beta^n}{\alpha^\delta - \beta^\delta},$$

where $\delta = 1$ for odd n and $\delta = 2$ for even n .

We say that a prime number p is a *primitive divisor* of a Lucas number u_n if p divides u_n but does not divide $(\alpha - \beta)^2 u_2 \cdots u_{n-1}$. Similarly, p is a primitive divisor of a Lehmer number u_n if p divides u_n but not $(\alpha^2 - \beta^2)^2 u_3 \cdots u_{n-1}$.

In the first article [8] of this series, we enumerated all Lucas and Lehmer sequences whose n -th element has no primitive divisor for certain $n \leq 12$ and all $12 < n \leq 30$ as well as presenting some strong numerical evidence to support the above conjecture. Then, in [9], we established that the conjecture was true if the absolute logarithmic height of β/α , $h(\beta/\alpha)$, is at most four.

Here we wish to determine a number C such that if $n > C$ then u_n always has a primitive divisor. For α and β real, the work of Carmichael [1], Ward [11] and Durst [2] shows that one can take $C = 12$. Since the twelfth Fibonacci number has only 2 and 3, the third and fourth Fibonacci numbers, as its prime divisors, this result is best possible.

When α and β are complex, we have $|\beta/\alpha| = 1$ which makes it much more difficult to obtain the necessary lower bounds for $|(\beta/\alpha)^d - 1|$. Using lower bounds for linear forms in logarithms, Schinzel [6] was the first to prove the existence of an absolute bound on n in this case.

Stewart [7] established an explicit version of Schinzel's result, proving that one can take $C = e^{452}2^{67}$ for Lucas sequences and $C = e^{452}4^{67}$ for Lehmer sequences. In Theorem 2 of [9], we showed that one may take $C = 2 \cdot 10^{10}$ in both cases. The method of obtaining this result was the same as Stewart's, however, we benefited from the dramatic improvements in the lower bounds for linear forms in logarithms since the time of Stewart's work.

In this article, we show that the value of C may be taken even smaller.

Theorem 1. *For all $n > 30,030$, the n -th element of any Lucas or Lehmer sequence has a primitive divisor.*

Our principal tool in proving this theorem is a lower bound for linear forms in two logarithms. For many purposes, including our own here, the following result is the best presently known; its proof uses a judicious combination of the work of Laurent, Mignotte and Nesterenko [3] and Liouville's inequality.

Theorem 2. (i) *Let γ be a non-zero algebraic number of degree d over $\mathbb{Q}$ with $d\mathbf{h}(\gamma) > 8$. Letting $\log \gamma$ denote the principal value of the logarithm of γ and letting b_1 and b_2 be rational integers, we put*

$$\Lambda = b_1 i\pi - b_2 \log \gamma.$$

If $\Lambda \neq 0$ then

$$\log |\Lambda| > -c_1(B)d^3\mathbf{h}(\gamma)\log^2 B,$$

where

$$c_1(B) = \min \left(\frac{\log 2}{16d\log^2 B} + \frac{B}{2d^2\log^2 B}, 22.36 \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{0.28}{\log B} + \frac{1.8}{d\log B} \right)^2 \right).$$

and $B = \max(2, |b_1|, |b_2|)$.

(ii) Using the same notation and hypotheses as in (i), if $\Lambda \neq 0$ then

$$\log |\Lambda| > -9.1d^3h(\gamma) \log^2 B.$$

Our proof of Theorem 1 proceeds in two steps. We use part (ii) of Theorem 2 to establish an initial improvement to our bound for n , while Theorem 2 (ii) will be used in direct calculations to eliminate smaller values of n . The integer 30030 is the largest one for which we could not establish the necessary bounds needed to assert that u_n always has a primitive divisor.

Theorem 1 is quite an improvement on previous results, but the hardest part remains. One would need a significant decrease in the size of the constants in Theorem 2 to bridge the gap completely. Quite likely, as is often the case when using lower bounds for linear forms in logarithms, a new approach will be necessary to complete the proof of the conjecture.

2. Linear Forms in Logarithms

To prove Theorem 2 we will use Théorème 1 of Laurent, Mignotte and Nesterenko [3].

Let us first remind the reader of the notation of [3].

We let γ be an algebraic number of absolute value one, which is not a root of unity, with $\log \gamma$ as the principal value of its logarithm. Let b_1 and b_2 be positive integers and Λ be as in the statement of Theorem 2 and put $D = [\mathbb{Q}(\gamma) : \mathbb{Q}]/2$.

For any positive integer S_1 , the set of numbers of the form $\pm\gamma^s$ with $0 \leq s < S_1$ has cardinality $2S_1$, so applying Théorème 1 of [3] with $\alpha_1 = -1, \log \alpha_1 = \pi i, \alpha_2 = \gamma, a_1 = \rho\pi, a = a_2, R_1 = 2$ and $R_2 = R - 1$, we obtain the following result.

Lemma 1. *Let K and L be integers satisfying $K \geq 3$ and $L \geq 2$ and let R, S_1 and S_2 be positive integers with $R \geq 2$ and $2S_1 \geq L$. Let $\rho > 1$. We put $N = KL, S = S_1 + S_2 - 1$,*

$$g = \frac{1}{4} - \frac{N}{12RS} \quad \text{and} \quad b = ((R-1)b_2 + (S-1)b_1) \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} k! \right)^{-2/(K^2-K)}.$$

Let a be a positive real number satisfying

$$a \geq \rho |\log \gamma| + 2Dh(\gamma).$$

Suppose that

$$(1) \quad \text{Card } \{rb_2 + sb_1 : 0 \leq r < R-1, 0 \leq s < S_2\} > (K-1)L,$$

and that

$$(2) \quad K(L-1) \log \rho + (K-1) \log 2 - (D+1) \log N - D(K-1) \log b - gL(\rho\pi R + aS) > 0.$$

Then

$$|\Lambda'| > \rho^{-KL+(1/2)}$$

where

$$\Lambda' = \Lambda \cdot \max \left\{ \frac{LSe^{LS|\Lambda|/(2b_2)}}{2b_2}, \frac{LRe^{LR|\Lambda|/(2b_1)}}{2b_1} \right\}.$$

As a stepping stone to establishing Theorem 2, we shall use Lemma 1 to first prove the following lemma which is essentially Théorème 3 of [3] with some of the parameters and values changed in a manner more suited to our work here.

Lemma 2. *Let $b_1, b_2, \gamma, \log \gamma, \Lambda$ and D be as above. Suppose further that $Dh(\gamma) > 4$. Also put $a = 6\pi + 2Dh(\gamma)$ and*

$$H = \max \left(6, D \log \left(\frac{b_1}{a} + \frac{b_2}{6\pi} \right) + 2.95D + 1.8 \right).$$

If $\Lambda \neq 0$ then

$$\log |\Lambda| > -6.66aH^2.$$

2.1. Proof of Lemma 2

To prove this lemma, we will proceed as in Section 7 of [3] where the authors prove their Théorème 3.

We let $\rho = 6$ and $a = \rho\pi + 2Dh(\gamma)$. As in [3], we put

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lambda &= \log \rho, \\
 b' &= \frac{b_1}{a} + \frac{b_2}{\rho\pi}, \\
 h &= H - \lambda, \\
 L &= 2 + \left\lceil \frac{2h}{\lambda} \right\rceil, \\
 (3) \quad K &= 1 + \lceil k\rho\pi aL \rceil, \text{ where } k = 0.15756, \\
 R &= 2 + \left\lceil \sqrt{(K-1)L a / (\rho\pi)} \right\rceil, \\
 S_1 &= \left\lceil \frac{L+1}{2} \right\rceil \text{ and} \\
 S_2 &= 1 + \left\lceil \sqrt{\rho\pi(K-1)L/a} \right\rceil.
 \end{aligned}$$

As $H \geq 6 > 3\lambda$, from our choice of L , we have

$$(4) \quad 6 \leq L \leq \frac{2H}{\lambda}.$$

Therefore, the condition $L \geq 2$ from Lemma 1 holds. Notice as well that the hypothesis $2S_1 \geq L$ is satisfied and since $L \geq 2$, S_1 must be a positive integer, as required.

Since $a > 26.8$, our expression for K yields

$$(5) \quad K \geq 79.5L \geq 477.$$

So the requirement that $K \geq 3$ is certainly met.

Thus $(K-1)L a / (\rho\pi)$ and $\rho\pi(K-1)L/a$ are both positive and as a consequence $R \geq 2$ and $S_2 \geq 1$. Now all the conditions at the beginning of the statement of Lemma 1 are satisfied.

From the definition of H , we deduce that

$$(6) \quad h \geq D \log b' + 2.95D.$$

Still following [3], we prove the following lemmas.

Lemma 3. *Recalling that*

$$b = ((R-1)b_2 + (S-1)b_1) \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} k! \right)^{-2/(K^2-K)},$$

with the above definitions, we have

$$\log b \leq \log(b') + 2.5 - \frac{\log(2\pi K/\sqrt{e})}{K-1} \leq \frac{h}{D} - 0.45 - \frac{\log(2\pi K/\sqrt{e})}{K-1}.$$

Proof. From (4) and (5), it follows that $R-2 = \left\lceil \sqrt{(K-1)La/(\rho\pi)} \right\rceil \geq 63$ and so we have $R-1 < 1.02(R-2)$.

In addition,

$$K-1 = \lceil k\rho\pi aL \rceil \geq k\rho\pi aL - 1 = \frac{k\rho\pi aL - 1}{k\rho\pi aL} k\rho\pi aL.$$

From (4), we now see that $K-1 \geq (476/477)k\rho\pi aL$. Using this inequality and proceeding in a similar way, we have $S_2-1 \geq (43/44)\sqrt{(476k/477)\rho\pi}L$. Hence

$$\frac{S_1-1}{S_2-1} \leq \frac{L-1}{0.775\rho\pi L} < 0.07.$$

Since $(R-2)\rho\pi, (S_2-1)a \leq \sqrt{\rho\pi a(K-1)L}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (R-1)b_2 + (S-1)b_1 &\leq 1.07((R-2)b_2 + (S_2-1)b_1) \\ &\leq 1.07b'\sqrt{\rho\pi a(K-1)L}. \end{aligned}$$

The remainder of the proof follows the proof of Lemme 10 in [3]. $\square$

Our next lemma is a slight refinement of Lemme 11 of [3].

Lemma 4. *Letting g be as in Lemma 1, we have*

$$gL(\rho\pi R + aS) \leq \left(\frac{\sqrt{k}}{3} + \frac{1}{6\rho\pi} \right) a\rho\pi L^2 + 0.64aL.$$

Proof. The proof is identical to the proof of Lemme 11 in [3], except that our upper bound for $\sigma = aL(1/6 + 2\rho\pi/(3a))$ differs due to our choice of ρ and a . $\square$

2.1.1. Examination of (2)

We let

$$\Phi = K(L-1)\lambda + (K-1)\log 2 - (D+1)\log(KL) - D(K-1)\log b - gL(\rho\pi R + aS).$$

This is the left-hand side of (2). From Lemmas 3 and 4, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi &\geq K(L-1)\lambda + (K-1)\log 2 - (D+1)\log(KL) - (K-1)h + 0.45(K-1)D \\
&\quad + D\log\left(\frac{2\pi K}{\sqrt{e}}\right) - \left(\frac{\sqrt{k}}{3} + \frac{1}{6\rho\pi}\right)\rho\pi aL^2 - 0.64aL \\
&\geq \frac{K(L-1)\lambda}{2} + (K-1)\log 2 - \log K - (D+1)\log L + h + 0.45KD + 0.88D \\
&\quad - \left(\frac{\sqrt{k}}{3} + \frac{1}{6\rho\pi}\right)\rho\pi aL^2 - 0.64aL,
\end{aligned}$$

the last inequality following from collecting like terms together and noting that $\lambda(L-1) - h \geq \lambda(L-1)/2$ because of our choice of L . We now write the last expression as the sum of two terms Φ_1 and Φ_2 , where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_1 &= \frac{KL\lambda}{2} - \left(\frac{\sqrt{k}}{3} + \frac{1}{6\rho\pi}\right)\rho\pi aL^2 \text{ and} \\
\Phi_2 &= \left(0.45D + \log 2 - \frac{\lambda}{2}\right)K + h - 0.64aL - \log K - (D+1)\log L + 0.88D - \log 2.
\end{aligned}$$

We therefore have $\Phi \geq \Phi_1 + \Phi_2$.

Since $K \geq \rho\pi aL$, we obtain

$$\frac{\Phi_1}{\rho\pi aL^2} \geq \frac{\lambda k}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{k}}{3} - \frac{1}{6\rho\pi}.$$

We want the quantity on the right to be positive and it is this condition which leads us to our choice of k .

For Φ_2 , we note that $aL \leq K/(k\rho\pi) < 0.337K$, so

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_2 &\geq (0.45D - 0.42)K + h - \log(KL) - D\log L + 0.88D - \log 2 \\
&\geq D\Phi_{21} + \Phi_{22},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Phi_{21} = 0.005K - \log L + 0.88 \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_{22} = 0.025K - \log(KL) - \log 2.$$

Now $0.013K \geq L$ and $K \geq 477$, so both of these quantities are positive. Therefore, (2) holds for the choice of parameters given in the beginning of Section 2.1.

2.1.2. Conclusion of the proof

We will first use Lemma 1 to show that

$$(7) \quad \log |\Lambda'| > -6.65aH^2.$$

We have already shown that $K \geq 3, L \geq 2, R \geq 2, S_1 \geq 1, S_2 \geq 1, 2S_1 \geq L$ and that (2) holds. Moreover, since $|\log \gamma| \leq \pi$, the required condition on a also holds, so it only remains to consider (1).

Continuing to follow [3], we break the proof into two parts. First, we suppose that the numbers of the form $rb_2 + sb_1$ with $0 \leq r < R - 1$ and $0 \leq s < S_2$ are pairwise distinct. By the definition of R and S_2 , RS_2 is greater than $(K - 1)L$, so (1) holds.

In this case, all the hypotheses of Lemma 1 are satisfied and so

$$\log |\Lambda'| \geq -\lambda KL + \frac{\lambda}{2}.$$

From (4) and $a > 26.8$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda KL &\leq \lambda(1 + \rho\pi akL)L = \left(1 + \frac{1}{\rho\pi akL}\right) \lambda\rho\pi akL^2 \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\rho\pi akL}\right) \frac{4k\rho\pi}{\lambda} aH^2 < 6.65aH^2. \end{aligned}$$

We now consider the case when the numbers of the form $rb_2 + sb_1$ with $0 \leq r < R - 1$ and $0 \leq s < S_2$ are not pairwise distinct. In this case there exist two relatively prime integers r and s with

$$0 < |r| < R - 1, \quad 0 < |s| < S_2 \quad \text{and} \quad rb_2 + sb_1 = 0.$$

We may assume that b_1 and b_2 are also relatively prime, for otherwise we can remove the common factor and get a better lower bound for $|\Lambda|$. Thus $r = b_1$ and $s = b_2$, and since $L \geq 2$, we have $LR/(2b_1) > 1$ and $LS/(2b_2) > 1$. If $c > 0$, then $xe^{cx} > 1$ for all $x > 1$. So

$$\max \left\{ \frac{LSe^{LS|\Lambda|/(2b_2)}}{2b_2}, \frac{LRe^{LR|\Lambda|/(2b_1)}}{2b_1} \right\} > 1,$$

and $|\Lambda'| > |\Lambda|$.

Since $rb_2 + sb_1 = 0$, we can write $\Lambda = s \log \gamma - r \log(-1)$. Liouville's inequality along with the definitions of a, K and S_2 now yield

$$\begin{aligned} \log |\Lambda'| &> \log |\Lambda| \geq -D \log 2 - (S_2 - 1) Dh(\gamma) \geq -D \log 2 - (S_2 - 1) a/2 \\ &\geq -D \log 2 - \sqrt{k}\rho\pi aL/2. \end{aligned}$$

From the inequalities $L \leq 2H/\lambda$ and $H \geq 6$, we can verify that

$$\rho\pi a\sqrt{k}L < 8.4aH < 1.4aH^2.$$

Our definition of H and the assumption that b_1 and b_2 are positive show that $H > -D \log(6\pi) + 2.95D$ so $D \log 2 < 52H$. Since $a > 26.8$ and $H \geq 6$, $D \log 2 < 0.33aH^2$. Therefore $D \log 2 + \sqrt{k}\rho\pi aL/2 < 1.03aH^2$. This shows that (7) also holds if (1) is not true. Hence (7) holds in either case.

We now want to deduce Lemma 2 from (7). We establish this by contradiction. Suppose that

$$(8) \quad \log |\Lambda| \leq -6.66aH^2.$$

From the lower bound in (4), it is easy to show that $2 < 0.04\sqrt{k}aL$, $1/2 < 0.02\sqrt{k}\rho\pi L$ and $L/2 < 0.07\sqrt{k}\rho\pi L$. Combining these inequalities with our choice of parameters in (3) and with the upper bound in (4), we have

$$\max\left(\frac{LS}{2b_2}, \frac{LR}{2b_1}\right) \leq \max\left(\frac{LS}{2}, \frac{LR}{2}\right) \leq \max\left(\frac{1.1\sqrt{k}\rho\pi L^2}{2}, \frac{1.1\sqrt{k}aL^2}{2}\right) < 0.5aH^2.$$

Since $e^{-x} < 1/x$, from (8) we have $|\Lambda| < 1/(6.66aH^2)$, so

$$\max\left(\frac{LS e^{LS|\Lambda|/(2b_2)}}{2b_2}, \frac{LR e^{LR|\Lambda|/(2b_1)}}{2b_1}\right) \leq 0.5e^{1/13.3}aH^2 < 0.55aH^2.$$

Therefore,

$$\log |\Lambda'| < -\left(6.66 - \frac{\log(0.55aH^2)}{aH^2}\right)aH^2 < -6.653aH^2,$$

since $a > 26.8$ and $H \geq 6$. But this contradicts (7). Therefore, (8) cannot be correct and so our lemma follows.

2.2. Proof of Theorem 2

As in the proof of Lemma 2 of [9], we can assume that $|\gamma| = 1$ and that both b_1 and b_2 are non-zero. From the first of these assumptions and since γ is not a root of unity, we have $d \geq 2$. Moreover, since $\gamma \notin \mathbb{R}$, $D = d/2$.

Finally, we can suppose that both b_1 and b_2 are positive. Otherwise, we can write $\Lambda = \pm(b'_1 \log \gamma + b'_2 i\pi)$, where b'_1 and b'_2 are both positive integers. However, in this case, we can replace γ by γ^{-1} , and since we are taking the principal value of the logarithm, we have $\Lambda = \pm(-b'_1 \log \gamma + b'_2 i\pi)$, so we can put Λ in the form used in Lemma 2.

From Liouville's inequality see Exercise 3.4 of [10]), we obtain

$$|\Lambda| \geq 2^{-D} \exp(-DBh(\gamma)).$$

Since $dh(\gamma) > 8$, we see that

$$\log |\Lambda| > - \left(\frac{\log 2}{16d \log^2 B} + \frac{B}{2d^2 \log^2 B} \right) d^3 h(\gamma) \log^2 B.$$

To obtain the second term in the definition of $c_1(B)$, we turn to Lemma 2. We first want to obtain an upper bound for a in terms of d and $h(\gamma)$. We have

$$a \leq dh(\gamma)(6\pi/(dh(\gamma)) + 1) < 3.357dh(\gamma),$$

by our hypothesis that $dh(\gamma) > 8$.

Since $a > 26.8$, $1/a + 1/(6\pi) < 0.0904$, $H \leq \max(6, (d/2) \log B + 0.28d + 1.8)$. Thus

$$\log |\Lambda| > -22.36 \max \left(\frac{6}{d \log B}, \frac{1}{2} + \frac{0.28}{\log B} + \frac{1.8}{d \log B} \right)^2 d^3 h(\gamma) \log^2 B.$$

Notice that if $6/(d \log B) \geq 1/2 + 0.28/\log B + 1.8/(d \log B)$, then $B \leq 38$ (since $d \geq 2$), in which case the Liouville estimate is stronger. Therefore, we can replace the max by just the second term in it.

This establishes part (i) of Theorem 2.

Part (ii) follows by noting that $c_1(B)$ is always less than 9.1 for $d = 2$, the maximum occurring near $B = 5358$, and that, for fixed B , $c_1(B)$ decreases as d increases.

3. Preliminaries to the Proof of Theorem 1

Let α and β be algebraic numbers with $|\alpha| \geq |\beta|$ and $\beta/\alpha \notin \mathbb{R}$ of degree d satisfying $dh(\beta/\alpha) > 8$. We can prove the following lemma.

Lemma 5. (i) *If $n = 1$ or 2 , then*

$$\log 2 + n \log |\alpha| \geq \log |\alpha^n - \beta^n| \geq n \log |\alpha| - \left(\frac{d}{2} - 1 \right) \log 2 - \frac{dh(\beta/\alpha)}{2}.$$

(ii) *For $n \geq 3$, we have*

$$\log 2 + n \log |\alpha| \geq \log |\alpha^n - \beta^n| \geq n \log |\alpha| - c_3(n_*) d^3 h(\beta/\alpha) \log^2 n_*,$$

where $n_* = n/\gcd(n, 2)$ and $c_3(n_*) = c_1(n_*) + 0.02$.

Proof. (i) The upper bound follows directly from the triangle inequality and our assumption that $|\alpha| \geq |\beta|$.

We can write $\alpha - \beta = \alpha(1 - \beta/\alpha)$. By Liouville's inequality along with the fact that β/α is not a real number (see Exercise 3.4 of [10]),

$$\log |\beta/\alpha \pm 1| \geq -\left(\frac{d}{2} - 1\right) \log 2 - \frac{dh(\beta/\alpha)}{2}.$$

The result for $n = 1$ now follows.

If $n = 2$ then we can write $(\beta/\alpha)^2 - 1$ as $(\beta/\alpha - 1)(\beta/\alpha + 1)$. Now one of these two terms is of absolute value greater than $\sqrt{2}$, so the result follows from the Liouville inequalities above.

(ii) The upper bound follows as before.

For the lower bound, we consider the quantities $\log |(\beta/\alpha)^{n_*} \pm 1|$.

Using the maximum modulus principle and Schwarz' lemma, if $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}$ with $0 < r < 1$ such that $|z| \leq r$, we have

$$|\log(1 \pm z)| \leq \frac{|z \cdot \log(1 - r)|}{r},$$

Applying this result for $1 + z$ with $r = 1/3$ and $z = e^{n_* \log(\beta/\alpha)} - 1$ where we take the principal value of the logarithm, we see that either

$$|(\beta/\alpha)^{n_*} - 1| > 1/3 \text{ or } |\Lambda| = |n_* \log(\beta/\alpha) - k\pi i| < 1.3 |(\beta/\alpha)^{n_*} - 1| < 0.5,$$

for some integer k .

In the first case, the lemma holds so we need only consider the second case. Since we took the principal value of the logarithm of β/α , in this case, we have $-\pi < \text{Im}(\log(\beta/\alpha)) \leq \pi$ and so $|k| < n_* + 0.5/\pi$ or $|k| \leq n_*$.

As β/α is, by assumption, not a root of unity, $\Lambda \neq 0$. Thus we may apply Theorem 2 for $n_* \geq 2$, finding that

$$\log |\Lambda| > -c_1(m)d^3h(\beta/\alpha) \log^2 n_*.$$

For $n_* \geq 2$, we have $\log(1.3)/(d^3h(\beta/\alpha) \log^2 n_*) < 0.02$, upon recalling the hypotheses that $dh(\beta/\alpha) > 8$ and $d \geq 2$ (since $\beta/\alpha \notin \mathbb{R}$). Thus

$$\log |\alpha^{n_*} - \beta^{n_*}| \geq n_* \log |\alpha| - c_3(n_*)d^3h(\beta/\alpha) \log^2 n_*.$$

By the same reasoning as above, we also have

$$\log |\alpha^{n_*} + \beta^{n_*}| \geq n_* \log |\alpha| - c_3(n_*)d^3h(\beta/\alpha) \log^2 n_*.$$

Arguing as in part (i), we see that the lemma holds. $\square$

Finally we need bounds for the growth of arithmetic functions which will appear in the proof of Theorem 1.

Lemma 6. (i) Let $\omega(n)$ denote the number of distinct prime factors of n . For $n \geq 3$,

$$\omega(n) < \frac{1.3841 \log n}{\log \log n}.$$

(ii) For $n \geq 3$,

$$\varphi(n) \geq \frac{n}{e^\gamma \log \log n + 2.50637 / \log \log n},$$

where $\gamma = 0.57721 \dots$ is Euler's constant.

(iii) Let $p_1 = 2, p_2 = 3, \dots$ be the primes in increasing order. If $\omega(n) \geq 2$ then

$$\varphi(n) \geq n \prod_{i=1}^{\omega(n)} \frac{p_i - 1}{p_i}.$$

Proof. (i) This follows from Théorème 11 of [4].

(ii) This is Theorem 15 of [5].

(iii) If $n = q_1^{a_1} \cdots q_k^{a_k}$ is the factorization of n into primes then

$$\varphi(n) = n \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{q_i - 1}{q_i}.$$

Since $q_i \geq p_i$ for each i , the result follows. $\square$

Lemma 7. Suppose n is a positive integer and let

$$f(n) = \sum_{\substack{m|n \\ \mu(m)=1}} \log^2(n/m).$$

- (i) If $\omega(n) = 2$ then $f(n) < 2 \log^2 n - 3.5 \log n + 3.5$.
- (ii) If $\omega(n) = 3$ then $f(n) < 4 \log^2 n - 13.4 \log n + 15.5$.
- (iii) If $\omega(n) = 4$ then $f(n) < 8 \log^2 n - 41 \log n + 71$.
- (iv) If $\omega(n) = 5$ then $f(n) < 16 \log^2 n - 117 \log n + 264$.
- (v) If $\omega(n) = 6$ then $f(n) < 32 \log^2 n - 309 \log n + 883$.
- (vi) If $\omega(n) = 7$ then $f(n) < 64 \log^2 n - 775 \log n + 2718$.
- (vii) If $\omega(n) = 8$ then $f(n) < 128 \log^2 n - 1886 \log n + 7913$.
- (viii) For any positive integer n , $f(n) < 2^{\omega(n)-1} \log^2 n$.

Proof. (i) It is easy to see that $f(n) \leq \log^2(n) + \log^2(n/6)$, since 6 is the first integer with two distinct prime factors. Expanding this sum and rounding-off the numbers, we obtain the given inequality.

(ii)-(vii) We proceed similarly in these cases. Suppose that $\omega(n) = k$. We take the sum of $\log^2 n$ plus the sum of $\log^2(n/m)$ over the first $\binom{k}{2}$ positive square-free integers m with $\omega(m) = 2$, plus the sum of $\log^2(n/m)$ over the first $\binom{k}{4}$ positive square-free integers m with $\omega(m) = 4, \dots$

(viii) This is just the trivial upper bound. There are $2^{\omega(n)-1}$ divisors m of n with $\mu(m) = 1$ and for each of these $n/m \leq n$. $\square$

4. Proof of Theorem 1

We mentioned in the Introduction that if α and β are real then it is known that for $n > 12$, u_n has a primitive divisor. Thus we may suppose that α and β are complex conjugates.

Also notice that β/α is a root of $\alpha\beta X^2 - (\alpha^2 + \beta^2)X + \alpha\beta$. By our assumptions on α and β , $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 = (\alpha + \beta)^2 - 2\alpha\beta \in \mathbb{Z}$, so this polynomial has integer coefficients. Therefore, we can let $d = 2$ in Lemma 5 and we have $h(\beta/\alpha) = (\log |\alpha\beta|)/2 = \log |\alpha|$, since α and β are complex conjugates.

It is well-known that

$$\log |\Phi_n(\alpha, \beta)| = \sum_{m|n} \mu(m) \log |\alpha^{n/m} - \beta^{n/m}|.$$

From the upper bounds in Lemma 5 and the fact that

$$\sum_{m|n} \mu(m)(n/m) = \varphi(n),$$

we see that

$$(9) \quad \log |\Phi_n(\alpha, \beta)| \geq \varphi(n) \log |\alpha| - 2^{\omega(n)-1} \log 2 + \sum_{\substack{m|n \\ \mu(m)=1}} \log \left| \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha} \right)^{n/m} - 1 \right|.$$

Using the lower bounds in Lemma 5 and our observation concerning the heights of α and β/α , we find that $\log |\Phi_n(\alpha, \beta)|$ is greater than

$$\varphi(n)h(\beta/\alpha) - 2^{\omega(n)-1} \log 2 - h(\beta/\alpha) - 8h(\beta/\alpha) \sum_{\substack{m|n \\ \mu(m)=1}} c_3 \left(\left(\frac{n}{m} \right)_* \right) \log^2 \left(\frac{n}{m} \right)_*,$$

since $d = 2$, the third term arising from the possibility that $\mu(n)$ or $\mu(n/2)$ is 1.

Stewart [7, Section 5] has shown that if $|\Phi_n(\alpha, \beta)| > n$ then u_n has a primitive divisor. Combined with the fact, easily provable from Lemma 6(i) and some calculation, that $(\log n)/4 + 2^{\omega(n)-3} \log 2 + 1 < n^{1/4}$ for $n > 42$, this implies that we need only show that

$$(10) \quad \varphi(n) - 8 \sum_{\substack{m|n \\ \mu(m)=1}} c_3 \left(\left(\frac{n}{m} \right)_* \right) \log^2 \left(\frac{n}{m} \right)_* - n^{1/4} > 0,$$

since $h(\beta/\alpha) > 4$.

Using Theorem 2(ii), we know that $c_3((n/m)_*) \leq 9.12$. Since $(n/m)_* \leq n/m$, from the bounds in Lemma 6(i) and (ii) along with Lemma 7(viii), we want to satisfy the inequality

$$\frac{n}{e^\gamma \log \log n + 2.50637 / \log \log n} - 36.5 \cdot 2^{1.3841 \log(n)/(\log \log n)} \log^2 n - n^{1/4} > 0.$$

Using Maple V, one can show that this inequality holds for $n > 18 \cdot 10^6$. Since $\omega(n) \geq 9$ implies that $n \geq 223,092,870$, we need only consider $\omega(n) \leq 8$.

If n is prime then (10) becomes $n - 1 - 9.12 \cdot 8 \cdot \log^2(n) - n^{1/4} > 0$. Again using Maple V, we see that this inequality holds for $n > 5400$.

Proceeding in a similar way, using Lemma 6(iii) and Lemma 7(i)–(vii), we find that u_n has a primitive divisor for $\omega(n) = k$ if $n > n_k$ where the n_k 's are given in Table 1.

k	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
n_k	5,400	43,000	109,000	256,000	527,000	$1.1 \cdot 10^6$	$2 \cdot 10^6$	$4 \cdot 10^6$

TABLE 1. Values of n_k

Notice that $n_8 < 9,699,690$ which is the smallest positive integer with eight distinct prime factors. Therefore, we do not need to consider the case of $\omega(n) = 8$.

If $\omega(n) = 7$ then we need only look at $510,510 \leq n \leq 2 \cdot 10^6$. Notice that $3 \cdot 5 \cdots 19$, the smallest odd integer with seven distinct prime divisors, is greater than n_7 . This implies that the n in the given range with $\omega(n) = 7$ are all even. Similarly, $2 \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \cdots 19 > n_7$ so these n must also be divisible by 3. Continuing in this manner, we find that n must be of the form

$n = p_1^{a_1} p_2^{a_2} p_3 p_4 p_5 p_6 p_7$ with $p_1 = 2, p_2 = 3, p_3 = 5$ or $7, p_4 = 7$ or $11, p_5 = 11, 13$ or $17, p_6 = 13, 17, 19$ or $23, 17 \leq p_7 \leq 61$, and $1 \leq a_1, a_2 \leq 2$. It turns out there are 58 of such integers and for each of them we calculated the left-hand side of (10) using Maple V. This quantity was positive except for the four cases 510510, 570570, 690690 and 746130.

To eliminate these four cases we notice that if n is odd then $\Phi_{2n}(\alpha, \beta) = \Phi_n(\alpha, -\beta)$. Therefore, if $|\Phi_n(\alpha, -\beta)| > 2n$ then $|\Phi_{2n}(\alpha, \beta)| > 2n$ and u_{2n} has a primitive divisor.

Some computation, along with Lemma 6(i), shows that $(\log(2n))/4 + 2^{\omega(n)-3} \log 2 + 1 < n^{1/4}$ for $n > 210$, so (10) implies that $|\Phi_n(\alpha, -\beta)| > 2n$ if $n > 210$. We calculated the left-hand side of (10) for $n = 255255, 285285, 345345$ and 373065 . In each case, it is positive. Therefore, $u_{510510}, u_{570570}, u_{690690}$ and u_{746130} always have primitive divisors. We can conclude that if $\omega(n) = 7$ then u_n has a primitive divisor.

We now consider the case of $\omega(n) = 6$. For such $n = p_1^{a_1} p_2^{a_2} p_3^{a_3} p_4^{a_4} p_5^{a_5} p_6^{a_6}$ with $n \leq 1.1 \cdot 10^6$, we have $2 \leq p_1 \leq 3, 3 \leq p_2 \leq 7, 5 \leq p_3 \leq 13, 7 \leq p_4 \leq 29, 11 \leq p_5 \leq 71, 13 \leq p_6 \leq 467, 1 \leq a_1 \leq 6, 1 \leq a_2 \leq 4, 1 \leq a_3 \leq 3$ and $1 \leq a_4, a_5, a_6 \leq 2$. There are 2672 such positive integers and, again, we calculated the left-hand side of (10) for each of these integers, this time using UBASIC 8.74 for the sake of speed. The largest two integers with $\omega(n) = 6$ for which the left-hand side of (10) is not positive are 480480 and 482790. The left-hand side of (10) is positive for $n = 241395$ and hence, arguing as above, u_{482790} always has a primitive divisor. However, 480480 is not congruent to 2 mod 4 so we cannot apply the same argument here. But there is one more idea we can take advantage of.

Among the terms $|(\beta/\alpha)^{n/m} - 1|$ with $\mu(m) = 1$ there will be one that is the smallest: suppose the minimum occurs for $m = r$. We can use this fact to complete the proof of the theorem. Let us write $(\beta/\alpha)^{n/m}$ as $e^{i\theta_m}$ where $-\pi < \theta_m \leq \pi$.

We first show that $|\theta_r| < 1/n^2$ for $n > 30$. If $|\theta_r| \geq 1/n^2$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \log |(\beta/\alpha)^{n/m} - 1| &\geq \log |(\beta/\alpha)^{n/r} - 1| = \log \sqrt{2 - 2 \cos \theta_r} \\ &> \log \sqrt{2 - 2 \cos (1/n^2)} > -2.001 \log n, \end{aligned}$$

for every m which is a divisor of n with $\mu(m) = 1$ once $n > 30$. Using (9) and our assumption that $h(\alpha) > 4$ (recall that $d = 2$), if

$$\varphi(n) - 2^{\omega(n)-3}(\log(2) + 2.001 \log n) > \frac{\log n}{4}$$

then u_n always has a primitive divisor.

Applying both parts of Lemma 6, one can show that this inequality is true if $n > 142$ and a quick direct calculation shows that the inequality holds for $30 < n < 143$ too. So we may assume that $|\theta_r| < 1/n^2$.

We now want to find an expression for θ_m in terms of θ_r, r and m . Since $(\beta/\alpha)^n = e^{ir\theta_r} = e^{im\theta_m}$, we have

$$\theta_m = \frac{r\theta_r}{m} + \frac{2\pi k}{m},$$

for some $0 \leq k < m$.

Since θ_r is the minimum angle in absolute value, if $m > r$ then we must have $k \neq 0$. We saw that $|\theta_r| < 1/n^2$, so for $n > 30$, if $m > r$ then $|\theta_m| > 6/m$. From this we can conclude that for such m ,

$$\left| \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha} \right)^{n/m} - 1 \right| = |e^{i\theta_m} - 1| = \sqrt{2 - 2\cos\theta_m} > \frac{1}{m}.$$

When $m \leq r$, we simply use

$$\left| \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha} \right)^{n/m} - 1 \right| \geq \left| \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha} \right)^{n/r} - 1 \right|.$$

Returning to (9) and applying Lemma 5 only in the case where n is replaced by n/r , we have

$$\log |\Phi_n(\alpha, \beta)| > h(\beta/\alpha)F(n) \quad \text{where}$$

$$F(n) = \min_{r|n, \mu(r)=1} \left(\varphi(n) - 2^{\omega(n)-3} \log 2 - \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\substack{m|n, m>r \\ \mu(m)=1}} \log m \right. \\ \left. - \sum_{\substack{m|n, m \leq r \\ \mu(m)=1}} \max \left(1, 8c_3 ((n/r)_*) \log^2 \left(\frac{n}{r} \right)_* \right) \right),$$

since $h(\beta/\alpha) > 4$. The maximum expression, along with the 1 inside it, in the last term are there to cover the possibility that $r = n/2$ or $r = n$.

Using UBASIC 8.74, we computed $F(n)$ for each of the $n \leq 480,480$ with $\omega(n) = 6$ and (10) not positive. We found that $F(n) > (\log n)/4$ for all $n > 265,650$. There are 61 values of n less than or equal to 265,650 with $\omega(n) = 6$ and $F(n) \leq (\log n)/4$. Fortunately, each of these is congruent to 2 mod 4 and so $\log |\Phi_n(\alpha, \beta)| > F(n/2)$. With the exception of $n = 30030$ where $F(15015) = -691.61$, $F(n/2) > (\log n)/4$ for each of these n . As a consequence, Theorem 1 holds if $\omega(n) = 6$ and $n > 30030$. This whole procedure was automated using UBASIC 8.74 and its execution took about 200 seconds on an IBM-PC compatible computer with a 486DX CPU running at 33 MHz.

We proceed in the same way in the cases of $\omega(n) = 3, 4$ and 5. There are 18569 positive integers less than 527,000 with $\omega(n) = 5$. It took about 860 seconds to check, for all these values of n , whether u_n always has a primitive divisor using $F(n)$ and $F(n/2)$, where appropriate. For all $n > 28980$, we were able to prove this while $F(28980) < -75.16$.

We checked all 46412 positive integers with $\omega(n) = 4$ and $n < 256,000$ in about 785 seconds. For all $n > 26880$, either $F(n)$, or $F(n/2)$ where appropriate, was greater than $\log(n)/4$ and $F(26880) = -173.84$.

Checking all the 42318 positive integers with $\omega(n) = 3$ and $n < 109,000$ took about 445 seconds. For all $n > 23040$, either $F(n)$ or $F(n/2)$ was greater than $\log(n)/4$ and $F(23040) = -6.5$.

Finally, we checked the 15491 positive integers with two distinct prime divisors which are less than 43,000 in about 100 seconds. Here we only used the simpler inequality (10) and the largest such integer for which this inequality did not hold was 24,576, where the left-hand side was -94.09.

These computations along with the results mentioned above comprise the proof of Theorem 1.

To conclude, let us note that to ensure accuracy, in many cases, results obtained using UBASIC 8.74 were checked in Release 3 of Maple V. This includes the computation of (10), $F(n)$, $F(n/2)$ and the number of integers with a given number of distinct prime divisors in certain intervals. In fact, the first three quantities were tested by hand for a few values of n . No discrepancy beyond round-off error was ever found.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. D. CARMICHAEL. On the numerical factors of the arithmetic forms $\alpha^n \pm \beta^n$. *Ann. of Math.* (2) **15** (1913), 30–70.
- [2] L. K. DURST. Exceptional real Lehmer sequences. *Pacific J. Math.* **9** (1959), 437–441.
- [3] M. LAURENT, M. MIGNOTTE and Y. NESTERENKO. Formes linéaires en deux logarithmes et déterminants d’interpolation. *J. Number Theory* **55** (1995), 285–321.
- [4] G. ROBIN. Estimation de la fonction de Tchebychef θ sur le k -ième nombre premier et grandes valeurs de la fonction $\omega(n)$ nombre de diviseurs premiers de n . *Acta Arith.* **XLII** (1983), 367–389.
- [5] J.B. ROSSER and L. SCHOENFELD. Approximate formulas for some functions of prime numbers. *Illinois J. Math.* **6** (1962), 64–94.
- [6] A. SCHINZEL. Primitive divisors of the expression $A^n - B^n$ in algebraic number fields. *J. reine angew. Math.* **268/269** (1974), 27–33.
- [7] C. L. STEWART. Primitive divisors of Lucas and Lehmer sequences. in *Transcendence Theory: Advances and Applications* (A. Baker and D.W. Masser, eds.), (Academic Press, 1977).
- [8] P. M. VOUTIER. Primitive divisors of Lucas and Lehmer sequences. *Math. Comp.* **64** (1995), 869–888.
- [9] P. M. VOUTIER. Primitive divisors of Lucas and Lehmer sequences, II. *Journal de Théorie des Nombres de Bordeaux* **8** (1996), 251–274.
- [10] M. WALDSCHMIDT. *Linear Independence of Logarithms of Algebraic Numbers*. (Matscience Lecture Notes, 1992).
- [11] M. WARD. The intrinsic divisors of Lehmer numbers. *Ann. of Math.* (2) **62** (1955), 230–236.